



ARTICLE

THE “HOUR OF SELF-CRITICISM”: DIAGNOSES ON HISTORIOGRAPHY AND THE TRAINING OF HISTORIANS IN BRAZIL, 1960S-1970S¹

Contact

ICHS – PPG / PPHR - Campus Seropédica
Address: BR-465, Km 7, s/n
23.897-000 – Seropédica – Rio de Janeiro – Brazil
rebecagontijo@ufrj.com

 Rebeca Gontijo²

Federal Rural University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRRJ)
Seropédica – Rio de Janeiro – Brazil

Abstract

This paper examines a set of reference speeches delivered in three Brazilian academic events in the 1960s and 1970s: the 1st Symposium of History Scholars in Higher Education (1961); the 1st Brazilian Conference on Introduction to the Study of History (1968); and the 1st IEB Seminar on Brazilian Studies (1971). It analyzes the way in which these speeches conveyed a diagnosis on the History subject, with their remarks on what had been already achieved, as well as what still needed to be done in the field. Its hypothesis is that the training of teachers and historians became an object of attention in these debates, while some benchmarks for university practices were outlined, to build consensus around the identified problems and their possible solutions, while stimulating a certain collective awareness about past, present and future possibilities for history-studies in Brazil.

Keywords

1st Symposium of History Scholars in Higher Education (1961) – 1st Brazilian Conference on Introduction to the Study of History (1968) – 1st IEB Seminar on Brazilian Studies (1971) – Historiography – Historians' training.

¹ This text has not been published on a preprint platform. All sources and bibliographical references are listed below. The paper presents some issues and preliminary perceptions, which evolved through the research project “Being a historian in Brazil: the disciplinarization of history and the construction of the historian’s *ethos* in the country, 1950-1970”, which began with my post-doctoral studies at the Federal University of Ouro Preto (April to July 2023), under the supervision of Prof. Valdeir Lopes de Araújo, and at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (August to December 2023), under the supervision of Prof. Eliana de Freitas Dutra. The project received funding from the Carlos Chagas Filho Foundation of the State of Rio de Janeiro for Research Support (FAPERJ, public notice 13/2023). I am thankful to the *ad hoc* peer reviewers of the periodical *Revista de História* for their suggestions and questions, which have contributed to the revision of this paper and of its hypothesis. Translator: Dermeval de Sena Aires Junior.

² PhD in History, Federal Fluminense University. Professor of the Department of History at the Institute of Human and Social Sciences, Federal Rural University of Rio de Janeiro in Seropédica, RJ, Brazil.



ARTIGO

A “HORA DA AUTOCRÍTICA”: DIAGNÓSTICOS SOBRE A HISTORIOGRAFIA E A FORMAÇÃO DO HISTORIADOR NO BRASIL, ANOS 1960-1970

Contato
ICHS – PPG / PPHR – Campus Seropédica
BR-465, Km 7, s/n
23.897-000 – Seropédica – Rio de Janeiro – Brasil
rebecagontijo@ufrj.com



Rebeca Gontijo

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro
Seropédica – Rio de Janeiro – Brasil

Resumo

O artigo analisa discursos proferidos durante três eventos acadêmicos: o I Simpósio de Professores de História do Ensino Superior (1961); o I Encontro Brasileiro sobre Introdução ao Estudo da História (1968); e o I Seminário de Estudos Brasileiros do IEB (1971). O objetivo é compreender os diagnósticos sobre a área de História, observando indicações sobre o que foi realizado e o que seria preciso realizar. A hipótese é que, em meio aos debates, a formação do professor e do historiador foi objeto de atenção e alguns referenciais para as práticas universitárias foram elaborados, construindo consensos em torno de problemas e possíveis soluções, estimulando uma espécie de consciência coletiva acerca do passado, do presente e das possibilidades de futuro dos estudos históricos no Brasil.

Palavras-chave

I Simpósio de Professores de História do Ensino Superior (1961) – I Encontro Brasileiro sobre Introdução ao Estudo da História (1968) – I Seminário de Estudos Brasileiros do IEB (1971) – Historiografia – Formação do historiador

The current situation of history studies in Brazil, as regards university research and teaching, is by and large the same of the other social sciences, albeit aggravated by the legacy that was transmitted to the current generation of historians, which turned and still tries to turn history into a mere literary genre, without any scientific duties or ambitions. In this case, it is a suitable occupation for retired professionals, who use the funds of certain institutions to pursue a dignifying form of leisure, and go on picking up crumbs in a work that only holds back the study of history, inasmuch as they often have no commitment at all with science or with consciousness... Therefore, we reiterate that the depiction of the current stage of historical research in Brazil either corresponds to, or yet merges with the overall issue that besets Brazilian scientific thought (LAPA, 1976, p. 97).

The heading above summarizes J.R. Amaral Lapa's view³ on the state of history studies, social sciences in general, and scientific thought in Brazil in the mid-1970s. Beyond his criticism of those who were then turning history into "a mere literary genre, without any scientific duties or ambitions", he also drew attention to problems such as the neglect in regard to working instruments, vices related to the "operational capacity of historians", isolation, the lack or misuse of funds, the indifference of public authorities and private institutions, the aloofness of Brazil's self-absorbed scholars – who avoided interacting by not communicating the results

³ José Roberto do Amaral Lapa (1929-2000) obtained a licentiate degree in geography and history at the Catholic University of Campinas' School of Philosophy. Next, he earned a bachelor's degree in legal sciences at the same institution, and a PhD in science at the Marília School of Philosophy, Sciences and Linguistics (FFCL) in 1966, under the supervision of Sérgio Buarque de Holanda. Amaral Lapa taught at FFCL in Marília and, further on, at UNICAMP. He is the author of the books *A história em questão: historiografia brasileira contemporânea* ("History in question: contemporary Brazilian historiography", published in 1976), and *História e historiografia – Brasil pós-64* ("History and historiography – Brazil after 1964", published in 1985), among other works. Lapa was active at FFCL in Marília when the institution held the 1st Symposium of History Scholars in Higher Education in 1961, and was a member of the event's organizing committee. He was the author of its first motion on the establishment of an entity to join together history scholars from the universities (initially named APUH), which was supported with a recognition of the "pioneering initiative of the professors from the Marília School of Philosophy, Sciences and Linguistics during the 2nd APUH Symposium, held in 1962 at the University of Paraná, in Curitiba" (Anais, 1962, p. 22). He was a member of the APUH board of directors in 1961-1965, 1965-1967 and 1972-1973. One of the aims of this study is to identify relevant figures in the field in the decades of 1950-1970, considering factors such as their supervision of MSc and PhD dissertations and theses, participation in academic committees for MSc, PhD and full professorship defenses, publication of reviews, prefaces and analyses, participation in academic events (above all, in organizing these events and conference and panel speakers) and participation in activities for the accreditation of the first graduate courses and programs in the country, starting in the 1970s. Lapa is to be included in this group. His interpretation is underscored in the introduction of this paper because the study of his texts has raised some key issues on the history of Brazilian historiography, leading to the search for other sources from the same period.

of their studies -, and inattentiveness to terminology and the appropriate use of concepts, in addition to methods. Such situation was identified both inside and outside higher education courses, even though the latter were still able to achieve something in terms of publications. Amaral Lapa also points out that some reputable names in history studies were outside the university-milieu and were antagonized by it (LAPA, 1976, p. 97-98).

The central issue here is that a historian interested in investigating the trends of Brazilian historiography and occupied with the production of critical assessments on the field in the mid-1970s, such as Lapa was, considered that Brazilian historiography was then experiencing its “hour of self-criticism” (LAPA, 1976, p. 200). Such self-criticism, which led to a crisis-diagnosis, is what this paper sets out to understand. It is not about agreeing or not with such perspective, which asserts that the 1970s were a time for “becoming aware” of the state of history studies in Brazil, as if critical awareness had not yet been seen. Instead, it is about grasping why Lapa and other historians⁴ made statements such as these at that point in time. And why, in doing so, they delineated a sort of map of the history of Brazilian historiography and pointed the paths previously taken, as well as the paths yet to be trodden, in an at once retrospective and prospective movement.⁵

Lapa expressed his concerns about the stage of historical studies then, which he defined as critical. His diagnosis led to the perception that sciences such as economics, sociology, politics and anthropology were “set free from the semantic and theoretical commitments and restraints that previously burdened them, having

⁴ In addition to Lapa, I identify a perception of crisis of history as a subject along the 1960s and 1970s in statements and publications of José Honório Rodrigues (1913-1987), Francisco Iglésias (1923-1999), Nilo Odália (1928) and Carlos Guilherme Mota (1941). The annals of the three events studied in this paper help us shed light on the discussions held in the course of the decade. Some considerations by Rodrigues and Iglésias will be approached in the second and third sections below, respectively. The other cited authors, in turn, will not be dealt with here, but they are among my research sources, along with historians such as Alice Canabrava (1911-2003), Cecilia Westphalen (1927-2004), Emília Viotti da Costa (1928-2017) and Maria Yedda Linhares (1921-2011). Several memory narratives were produced subsequently. They will not be covered in this paper, since they constitute another type of source and require their adequate methodology, among other reasons. This paper’s focus of interest are the analyses produced “in the heat of the moment” in the 1960s and 70s.

⁵ I use the terms “retrospective” and “prospective” in regard to the history of historiography, because I consider them to be productive for expressing two frequently interlinked movements in the field: the former investigates the past of the subject, while the latter is aimed at the present and future, by pointing to trends or expectations. In this case, the two notions refer to the attempt to reconstitute the past, the present and possible futures, as well as the futures aspired to by analysts in the 1960s and 70s. Some studies on the Brazilian historiography of these two decades, which were written after the 1970s, serve as a counterpoint in this regard. For instance, BURMESTER, 1998, and FREIRE, 2020.

reached a degree of maturity by which they became distant from history in and of Brazil" (LAPA, 1976, p. 8).

This remark by Lapa is based on the idea that, in Brazil, the production of history has been guided from its onset by two key drivers: on the one hand, the directed and objective attempt to learn about the Brazilian past; and, on the other, the reflection of national history models expressed by foreign investigative methods and techniques, as well as by foreign themes, concepts and ideologies. For Lapa, there was a conceptual gap between history and the other human sciences, but the state of crisis was not only a result thereof. The "deinstitutionalization movement" of history experienced at that point was also perceived as a factor of the crisis.⁶

Paradoxically, there was a multiplication of graduate and specialization courses in history, and a progressive increase in the production of MSc dissertations and PhD theses in the 1970s, leading to what Lapa perceived as a massification of university courses. He saw both phenomena as reasons for concern. He also identified other types of crises, such as the ideological crisis, the crisis of the professional and editorial market, the crisis of readers and the crisis which expressed itself at the level of teaching and writing of historical works (LAPA, 1976, p. 9-10).

Based on the analysis of this active university author during a full-fledged military dictatorship – an author who was mapping and assessing the historiographic production of Brazilian universities –, this paper examines some events that bring to the discussion the role and the challenges experienced by the university subject of history in the 1960s and early 1970s. As a result of such challenges, Lapa and other interpreters of the reality diagnosed a crisis of history and affirmed that a process of "consciousness-raising" was taking place at that moment, to which they referred as "the hour of self-criticism". It still remained to be seen whether such crisis or self-critical movement regarded problems related to infrastructure, to the teaching-profession, to the career's restructuring, to the training of professionals not

⁶ Regarding the deinstitutionalization of history in the mid-1970s, I understand that Lapa's statement was linked to the changes produced by Law No. 5,692 (LDB), of August 11, 1971, which established the primary and secondary teaching levels (the latter of which was aimed at students' vocational training). Furthermore, from 1964 on, the degree of history teacher competed with the short-term teaching degree in social studies, for which primary level was enabled in 1971 (BRASIL, 1971). And since 1954, Ordinance 478 (08/06) of the Ministry of Education and Culture allowed holders of a teaching degree in pedagogy, philosophy and social sciences to teach secondary level-history. Ten years later, the Law on Guidelines and Foundations for National Education (LDB) was revised after being criticized by several sectors. In 1982, Law 7,044 changed some LDB provisions in connection with secondary teaching and put an end to the prevalence of specific over generalist education. For the legislation's impact on the training of history teachers, see, for instance: SANTOS, 2014, and NASCIMENTO, 2013.

only for teaching, but also for research activities, to an epistemic crisis in the field of history itself (considered as a science), or even to all these aspects.⁷

The study of other moments in the history of historiography helps us understand the idea of disciplinary crisis and can be useful for expanding the horizon of our expectations. The evidence of this negative diagnosis can be seen in a variety of discourses imparted in the annals of academic events. Highlights in the period covered by this article include some discussions held during the 1st Symposium of History Scholars in Higher Education in 1961; the 1st Brazilian Conference on Introduction to the Study of History in 1968; and the 1st Seminar of Brazilian Studies in 1971.

The annals of these events help shed light on part of the subject's trajectory and allow us to identify the debates-agenda and the actors who fueled the field within a given time frame. In the case of this study, they allow for the analyzing of the perceptions of members of the history field about historiography until that point in time, and on the training of historians.

This paper is structured in three parts, which describe some key aspects of the discussions held during each of the three events. Instead of focusing only on one of these meetings, it undertakes an interpretative effort to identify the themes around which the historians met at three different moments over a ten-year period. It then highlights the themes and issues considered useful for reflecting on historiography, and on the historian's *ethos*. It does not have the intention of reviewing all topics debated in each event – a task that would not only be impossible for a paper, but would also extrapolate the aim of identifying discourses that help understand what was considered as relevant and, in certain cases, urgent to the point of eliciting a diagnosis of history-crisis. At the same time, I seek to identify what was said about the history of Brazilian historiography, as well as about historians and their practices.

My hypothesis is that in the 1960s and early 70s, some diagnoses and prognoses were produced amid the debates in these academic events on the situation

⁷ In a previous text, I drew attention to the crisis-idea in the discourse of some historians in the 1970s and described a number of issues that are also presented here. See GONTIJO (2017). More recently, Diego Fernandes Freire considered that the crisis perceived in the 1970s regarded the structural aspects that undermined the historical research-work in Brazil, instead of epistemological issues. See FREIRE (2020) and (2021). I agree that structural problems affected the development of historical studies and led to the perception of a crisis in the discipline or in the historiographic production. However, I believe it is pertinent to ask whether the discussions held and recorded during the events described in this paper allow us to realize distinct forms of conceiving the historian's work, as well as the role of history as a subject and of historical knowledge in the contemporary world. On the one hand, such inquiry raises approaches which are more pragmatic and mindful of the problems involved in the historians' training and in the profession of history. On the other, it raises some theoretical reflections, leading to a level of criticism that could produce tensions in the subject's epistemological assumptions.

of historical studies, and on the problems involved in the training of teachers and historians, which helped establish references for practices in the field of history, while outlining a professional profile. They also helped build consensus around the problems to be tackled. Some of these diagnoses pointed to an existing crisis in the field, through discourses that announced a process of "consciousness-raising". My key aim is to identify the problems that were discussed on those occasions, while outlining a collective understanding about the situation in the field.

Between teaching and research activities: the 1st APUH Symposium (Marília, SP, 1961)

As academics, we are all confronted with the same dilemma: should research activities be sacrificed because of teaching? Should we sacrifice teaching for research activities? How could we attain a synthesis between these two requirements of our profession, without which we would not be what we ought to be?

(Michel Mollat, Anais, 1962, p. 69).

Picture 1



A photo from the 1st Symposium of History Scholars in Higher Education, held in October 1961 at the School of Philosophy, Sciences and Linguistics of Marília, state of São Paulo. From left to right: José Roberto do Amaral Lapa, Jorge Calmon, Armando Souto Maior, Alice Piffer Canabrava, Eremildo Luiz Vianna, Cecilia Westphalen and Antonio Camilo Faria Alvim. From the CEDEM-UNESP collection.

The Association of History Scholars in Higher Education (APUH) was created in 1961 during the first symposium held at the School of Philosophy of Marília, São Paulo. Therefore, it was born within the context of the discussion on the reform of the universities.⁸ A certain “spirit of Marília” can be observed during the 1st Symposium. And this mark from São Paulo’s countryside was bound to remain for some time, due to a series of contingencies which are still largely unknown, even though the association sought to attract scholars from the entire country since its beginning.⁹

The annals of the 1st APUH (from 1971 on, ANPUH) Symposium¹⁰ provide some signs that help us understand the scope of the concerns experienced at that time, and shed light on the process through which professional historiography was established in Brazil.¹¹ In the website of today’s National Association of University Scholars of History, it can be read that its creation was an effort to meet the expectations of professionalization linked to teaching and research activities in the field, while “opposing, in a certain way, the tradition of self-thought historiography that was still largely majoritarian”.¹² The objective of the first symposium was to promote “the enhancement of history teaching in Brazil” by discussing the curriculum of

⁸ The topic of the reform of universities is part of the context of discussions on the so-called basic or core reforms, of which the campaign was launched in 1958 advocating the need for changes in many sectors, including education. The universities-reform gained strength in the seminars promoted by the National Union of Students in the early 1960s. Amid a diversity of views, the prevailing features were the criticism to the structure of higher education, which was considered backwards, and the fight against privatization processes and university entrance models based on *vestibular* exams, which inevitably imposed an economic selection on candidates. After the military coup of 1964, the State embraced the idea of the universities-reform and prioritized what it held to be an administrative and pedagogical modernization inspired by the North American model. Decree-Law 53, of November 18, 1966, and Decree-Law 252, of November 28, 1967, define the rules for restructuring the federal universities through the creation of departments, institutes or centers. On its turn, Law 5,540 of November 28, 1968 (Law on the Reform of the Universities), generalized the rules for all higher education institutions.

⁹ Over the 59 years of the Association, it was presided by members from São Paulo for 31 years, including 17 consecutive years from 1965 to 1985, and another 14 years with intervals. This strong presence of São Paulo members is also noticeable in ANPUH’s periodical *Revista Brasileira de História* (at least in its initial stage). The same happened in its events, whose first editions counted large attendance by São Paulo members (MELLO, 2012; SILVA, 2014, p. 264).

¹⁰ The Association of University Scholars of History was established in 1961 with the acronym APUH. After adopting the acronym ANPUH in 1971, it is currently the National Association of History, ANPUH.

¹¹ The following studies have drawn from the annals of the 1st APUH Symposium in 1961 as a source: Mauro Vaz Camargo Jr. (2016) analyzed the discussions on the role of the subject Introduction to Historical Studies for the training of students, by relating them with the issue of the professionalization of history; Thiago Rodrigues Nascimento (2017) approached the discussions on the curriculum and training of teachers during the 1st APUH Symposium; Paulo Thiago Santos Gonçalves da Silva (2014) investigated the process of creation and consolidation of the APUH /ANPUH between 1961 and 1977.

¹² <https://anpuh.org.br/index.php/quem-somos>; GLEZER, 2011.

higher education courses (Anais, 1962, p. 30). Its discussions did not take place without tensions.

In academic events, the selection of main speakers allows a few considerations on the host institution, as well as on the organizers and the audience.¹³ For instance, in the 1961 symposium, an interplay between the "new" and "old" realities can be pointed out. The former is linked to the School of Philosophy, Sciences and Linguistics of Marília itself, which was established in 1957, and whose history course started its activities in 1959. The latter, in turn, is associated to the university of the conference' speaker Michel Mollat (1911-1996), the Sorbonne University, which was created in the 13th century. This aspect is affirmed in Mollat's salutation, which builds a bond between the two institutions by ascribing to both, the new one and the old one, the attribute of "pioneers". One may also point to the guest speaker's linkages with the Annales school, which is a relevant aspect for the establishment of a "new" historiography at that point in time.

On their turns, two other conference speakers evince the symposium's diversity, namely Pedro Calmon (1902-1985) and Arthur Cezar Ferreira Reis (1906-1993) – both of whom were linked to the University of Brazil and members of the Brazilian Historic and Geographic Institute since the 1930s. Calmon was widely known as the author of a vast *oeuvre*, including his more recently published 7 volumes of *História do Brasil* (1959). Reis, in turn, was an eminent politician and historian, and an expert in history of the Amazon. Therefore, one may say that both the "traditional" and "new", or "modern", realities – always considered as relative notions – were present on this occasion. Different generations were willing to hear that history was no longer *événementielle* only, but this would not remove, according to Calmon, the primacy of politics over social history; furthermore, this would not overlook the fact that the history of Brazil does count on great masters from Handelman to Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, including names such as Capistrano de Abreu and Oliveira Vianna, as Reis asserted; and that the "new spirit in historical research", which emerged in France approximately in 1925, was about undertaking research work as a team, as Mollat mentioned.

But the symposium's moment seemed not to be one of the most favorable. One of its participants stated that the socio-cultural context in 1961 was hostile to historical studies, as the predominant concerns were linked to technical progress, and a premium was set on natural sciences. For this observer, whose standpoint

¹³ Paulo Thiago Santos Gonçalves da Silva produced a table with data on the origin of the speakers of each ANPUH symposium (3rd to 9th edition). Most speakers were from São Paulo (90), followed by speakers from Paraná (43) and Rio de Janeiro (31). See SILVA, 2014, p. 266.

I am highlighting here, amid a process of rapid changes, history should also step up its pace in terms of teaching and research. In practical terms, this meant that, “pedagogically, the maximum performance must be sought in the shortest possible time”. With a pragmatic outlook, Eduardo d’Oliveira França argued that history should help find solutions for the current issues drawing from the knowledge of the past, and that a national attitude should not be asserted in a way that generated obstacles to action. França believed that the present was the starting point for research, in such a way that “history should prefer the current issues, and must correspond to the requirements of the contemporary spirit around the ongoing social problems, and so on” (Anais, 1962, p. 104).

Picture 2



Participants of the 1st Symposium of History Scholars in Higher Education, held at the School of Philosophy, Sciences and Linguistics of Marília, state of São Paulo, 1961. From left to right: the third person is Maria Regina da Cunha Rodrigues Simões de Paula (1919), and the sixth is Eurípedes Simões de Paula (1910) (ANPUH BR).

Besides pointing to the disfavor of history *vis-à-vis* other sciences, França informs that the moment was forcing a revision of history teaching in terms of the aims, structures, workplans, and rhythm of its functions. The curricular issue of

history courses in the universities was being discussed at the same time as the ongoing debates on the reforming of universities in other dimensions. In this regard, the rapporteur's text is rich in propositions. For França, it would be necessary to change the teaching practices, and teachers and professors should adopt a new attitude in relation to the knowledge that is being taught. This means that they should "renounce teaching the subject, or all the subject, and, instead of the subject, teach the work's technique", so that students could be led to reflect and to search for answers to the problems they were confronted with. The subject *per se*, that is, its content, should be seen as the outer substance in the transmission of a technique capable of developing the student's "critical spirit" (Anais, 1962, p. 104).

Picture 3



1st Symposium of History Scholars in Higher Education, held at the School of Philosophy, Sciences and Linguistics of Marília, state of São Paulo, 1961. From left to right: Rubens Borba de Moraes, Pedro Calmon, Fr. Carl Laga and José Roberto do Amaral Lapa. Acervo CEDEM/UNESP.

The teaching system was structured around professorship chairs, whose leading practice was the *preleção*, i.e., an expositive lecture that sought to convey a pano-

ramic and ordered view of an approached theme.¹⁴ As a scholar trained by this system in the University of São Paulo's first History class almost thirty years before, França was then proposing a number of changes, since he understood that lectures as a way of “pouring knowledge are quite questionable”. This would demand a higher level of responsibility by scholars, as they should be up-to-date and able to select “what one will impart”. He also believed that students should not be induced to know what their lecturers know but, instead, what belongs to their lives, their culture and the socio-cultural realities of their country and their time. Moreover, França affirmed that “we also need to break away from the colonialism in which we have been living in the field of history, in contrast to other countries. We must create a system that corresponds to our needs, and not transfer foreign systems to this place” (Anais, 1962, p. 104-105).

While asking which curriculum and which aim were intended with the teaching of history, the author lists a series of objectives and underscores the role of his own field of expertise, namely modern history, which he considered to be special: to facilitate the development of consciousness in the present historical world, as well as for the man of today, while grasping the great lines of contemporary evolution and the historical wholeness of this world. But even though he criticized the alleged curricular colonization, he did not reject the modern milestones established by the Western and European viewpoint. At the end of the day, the key concern would be “to train professors” and “to produce historians” (Anais, 1962, p. 106). And in order to attain the proposed objectives, it would be necessary to consider the four teaching structures that were in place at that time, regarding the chair-professorship system, the courses, the students and the professionals. These were broad issues that the author sought to synthesize.

The debate that followed, regarding the universities' curriculum, shows some of the possibilities and limits that were outlined in the renewal of historical studies and in the training of historians and teachers.¹⁵ In general terms, there was a predominant idea that the curricula had to be revised, and that this was the first step for reforming higher education in history, and for improving the subject's standing in the intellectual scene.

¹⁴ Chair professorships were a lifelong post. Regarding the centrality of *preleção*-lectures in the teaching practices of the 19th and 20th centuries, see COSTA, 2018, p. 194. During the 1st Brazilian Congress of University Students of History, held in São Paulo in 1960, the students criticized both this lecturing format and the curricula, considering that the courses neither met the needs linked to the training of secondary-teaching professionals, nor the needs in terms of research-initiation (FERREIRA, 2013).

¹⁵ The survey undertaken by Marieta de Moraes Ferreira and Norma Lucia da Silva points to the existence of 65 history courses in public institutions between the 1930s and 1960s (SILVA & FERREIRA, 2011).

The report on the curriculum of university courses was presented by Olga Pantaleão, from the Marília School of Philosophy, Sciences and Linguistics. Two aspects guided her reflections: first, the finding that the courses which should train secondary level-teachers and researchers neither met the current demands in quantitative, nor in qualitative terms; and, second, the low level of preparedness among the students who were joining the courses, as a result of deficient secondary training, the absence of general culture and a lack of knowledge of languages – including Portuguese itself. Consequently, the progress of history was seen to be sluggish in the fields of research and training of faculty members, and the ongoing initiatives were seen to be too modest in contrast to a context seen by some participants as fast-moving, which required action in the sense of endowing each professional with a “researcher’s mentality” and promoting higher efficiency levels in all fields of knowledge (Anais, 1962, p. 223).

Pantaleão’s report was intensely criticized. Apparently, no agreement had been reached on the necessary guidance for solving the problem. And almost everyone had a curriculum to call their own. Each participant presented their options succinctly, except for Eduardo d’Oliveira França, who considered his own curriculum-project so subversive that he would not even dare to present it (Anais, 1962, p. 265).

Regarding the curriculum-issue, two general positions can be distinguished in the course of the symposium. On the one hand, some participants advocated for increased closeness to recent history, both in terms of research and faculty training, to meet the demands of the present; on the other, some participants argued for strengthening a generalist type of training, since they believed that this path would contribute to assert history as an independent science, without subjecting it to transitory interests. Although it was noticeable that the “consciousness-raising process of a vast non-European world” was in progress (Anais, 1962, p. 230), some historians considered it more didactic to follow the teaching-tradition to proceed from Europe outwards and approach other regions as one came into contact with them. Others, such as Iglésias, stated the case for the need to study contemporary Brazilian history, considering that the recent period motivated teaching and avoided the risk of seeing the recent history treated by experts in other subjects. On his turn, Francisco Falcon, in addition to expressing his concern with the complete disconnection from the Brazilian reality, proposed the creation of Afro-Asian study centers (Anais, 1962, p. 129 and 259).

Despite the divergencies experienced during the event, it can be pointed out that in general terms, the proposals presented by almost all participants were different but also had similarities. The prevailing view is a Eurocentric perspective comprising the training of teachers and researchers as a result of the linkages between erudition and research technique, while leaving aside the theoretical re-

flection on what historians and teachers do. It may be assumed that the diverging discourse served more as a rhetoric plea for stressing one's own conceptions than as a way of diametrically exposing opposite proposals. It even made it possible for some participants to propose doing something different, and even better, as long as business as usual could be maintained... (Anais, 1962, p. 265). All participants were concerned with the space to be ascribed to the subjects considered as basic ones, as well as the complementary ones.

The training of historians was conceived as an apprenticeship that should bring together technique and erudition, as a consequence of fewer expositive lectures (*preleções*) and an increased emphasis on practical works. These works consisted less in the study of the procedures of “traditional” history, so to speak, and more in applying the social science-methods. Cecilia Westphalen goes to the point of stating that “the important element is not the history-subject, but the training in methods and techniques” (Anais, 1962, p. 96).

Since it was not possible to teach everything, the transmission of the necessary historical research techniques, joined in with the specialized didactic experience for teaching the subject, were considered to be the fundamental features for training historians and teachers at a moment when, according to Alice Canabrava, history was still regarded as a science in its infancy, and not in its full maturity; or as a knowledge-form that was transposing the empirical stage – “the stage of narrative, of listing recorded facts” and had just arrived to the “field of rational knowledge” by compromising “the given for the infinitely likely, and the rigorously measurable for the measure's relativity” (Anais, 1962, p. 121).¹⁶

In addition to these specific remarks, another proposal had been submitted prior to Pantaleão's proposal. In a rather biased way, this previous attempt seems to have been corroborated by her interlocutors amid criticism. But the comments that followed did not address the rub of the matter in the rapporteur's observations. One participant even reminded the others that it was not the moment for dealing with the curriculum.¹⁷

¹⁶ Canabrava was echoing March Bloch, for whom “history is not only a science in movement. Like all those which have the human spirit as their object, this newcomer in the field of rational knowledge is also a science in its infancy”. Despite being old as a form of narrative, history was new as a rational analysis-endeavor which should be in tune with the intellectual achievements of the present (BLOCH, 2002 [1st French Ed., 1944], p. 47).

¹⁷ Paulo Silva underscores the tense atmosphere experienced during the event, in which the participants who wanted to discuss broader aspects such as the reform of the universities and the Brazilian reality opposed those who considered such issues a diversion. According to Silva, the ongoing divergency was not as strong in relation to the curricular and university reform, as it was in relation to the contending

Maria Yedda Linhares was responsible for presenting a report entitled "The locus of pedagogical subjects in the course of history". Before addressing this specific topic, Linhares drew attention to a set of problems linked to the schools of philosophy at that moment, which was characterized by the debate on the reform of universities. The clash between the country's new context and the persistence of institutions increasingly seen as inadequate to the nation's development was forcing a reforms-movement capable of dragging along advocates of the most varied trends, from revolutionary to conservative. According to her, the universities had failed due to not being able to meet the new needs of "propelling the historical process", and ceased to occupy their place in the production of technical and scientific knowledge, and in terms of creative intellectual action. For these reasons, she appealed to the "duty [as educators] to take part in the events, while aligning our ideas with the times in which we live", and warned about the risk of being left "by the wayside of history, as in the past" (Anais, 1962, p. 163).

Picture 4



Maria Yedda Linhares during the 1st APUH Symposium in 1961. Francisco Falcon is seated to her left (ANPUH BR).

perspectives on the "foundations, the direction and the aims of higher education-history courses" (SILVA, 2014, p. 181-184).

Linhares believed that the discussion on the training of history teachers was linked to the fate of the schools of philosophy in the structure of universities, as well as to the debate on their functions in the Brazilian society as a whole. After being created to provide basic teaching in the universities, they ended up tasked with the preparation of higher-level intellectual workers, by training “unbiased researchers” and secondary-level teachers. But in the early 1960s, one could conclude that they had failed in both tasks. The task of providing teachers for the growing demands of secondary education played an increasingly relevant role, but this did not necessarily lead to improvements in their training. One of her conclusions is that the duplicity of tasks – the training of teachers and researchers with the same curriculum – contributed to a state of things in which none of the two aims had been met in an efficient way. There would be, therefore, a “disturbing interference of two simultaneous objectives in the training courses-cycle” (Anais, 1962, p. 164 and 167).

Linhares points to two basic flaws in the systems which had been adopted until that moment: first, their curricular uniformity for covering both the bachelor degree and the licentiate degree, since the latter only differed from the former for the addition of pedagogical subjects in its final year (the so-called “3 + 1” program). And second, they lacked a clear definition of the objectives to be achieved in the training of specialists – who were bound to aspire to graduate studies, in the case of bachelor degree-holders, and to secondary-level teaching, in the case of licentiate degree-holders. She considered it a misconception to assume that a researcher was nested in a lecturer, and that a lecturer’s training would be broader than a researcher’s. In the case of the history-course, Linhares concluded that the schools of philosophy were training “self-learners” (Anais, 1962, p. 169).

Adding complexity to the reflection on the role of the pedagogical subjects in the history-course, Linhares anticipated the curricular debate by stating that to discuss its formal aspect without previously establishing what, for what and for whom one was expected to teach would not help attain the objective of training teachers and scholars. The report subsequently presented by Pantaleão and the discussion that followed it did not touch on these issues and was focused on the issue of the curriculum’s format. Thus, Linhares’ presentation seems to have led to an anticlimax for the debate on the curriculum that followed it, and anticipated problems that were not even approached when they should have been.

Seven years later, the Department of History of the Federal Fluminense University (UFF in the acronym in Portuguese) organized another event, which tackled the issue of the curriculum in higher education history courses, while discussing the teaching of a particular subject.

Method, theory and historiography during the 1st Brazilian Conference on Introduction to the Study of History (Nova Friburgo, RJ, 1968)

*(...) for the most part, our courses are idiotic; teaching is out-of-date, the
chair system is medieval, and tests belong, at best, to the 19th century*
(RODRIGUES, Anais, 1970, p. 30-31).

In the same year when the university reform was implemented and the Brazilian dictatorship became more repressive, a group of intellectuals from many parts of the country went up the hills of the state of Rio de Janeiro to meet in the city of Nova Friburgo. The 1st Brazilian Conference on Introduction to the Study of History was held on July 7-13, 1968, by the Department of History of the Federal Fluminense University, supported by APUH through its office in Rio de Janeiro. The meeting gathered representatives from ten states and 37 universities or individual colleges, in addition to international professors.¹⁸

The meeting's aim was to "exchange experiences, compare research orientations and debate specific problems in the teaching of the subject Introduction to the Study of History", to promote technical information exchanges and networking of interested actors (Anais, 1970, p. 3). Its focus on the introductory discipline made

¹⁸ The UFF historian João Pedro Esposel (1931-2018) presided the event's organizing committee. Its registered participants included representatives from the following states: Bahia, Guanabara, Minas Gerais, Pará, Paraná, Pernambuco, Rio de Janeiro, Rio Grande do Sul, Santa Catarina and São Paulo. As to the origin of the scholars who submitted papers for debate, the following distribution is found: Southeast (6) and South (1) of Brazil, in addition to four international scholars from Europe (France, Germany and the Netherlands) and South America (Uruguay). Other participants who presented papers (rapporteurs) for discussion were Maria Clara Rezende Constantino (1929), from the School of Philosophy, Sciences and Linguistics of Santos, São Paulo; Cecilia Westphalen (1927-2004), from the Federal University of Paraná; Odilon Nogueira de Matos (1916-2008), from the University of Campinas; Carlos Rama (1921-1982), from the University of Montevideo, Uruguay; Frédéric Mauro (1921-2001) from the University of Toulouse, France; Joseph van den Besselaar (1916-1991), from the Catholic University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands; Georg Erich Thomas, from the University of Cologne, Germany; Ruy Galvão de Andrada Coelho (1920-1990), from the University of São Paulo; and Victorino Félix Sanson (1924), from the Federal Fluminense University. The contributions of the following authors were not discussed by the plenary, but were included in the annals as an appendix: José Honório Rodrigues, Gadiel Perruci, Nilo Odália, Kátia M. de Queiróz Mattoso, and Johildo Lopes de Athayde. And the following scholars also participated in the debates: Emilia Viotti da Costa, Francisco Falcon, István Jancso, and Maria Yedda Linhares. Furthermore, historians such as Altiva Balhana and Caio César Boschi were also among the event's 98 registered participants. A second meeting took place at the Federal University of Juiz de Fora, in partnership with the local historical institute, on July 7-11, 1970; and a third meeting was held at the Catholic University of Campinas during the 1st São Paulo History Congress on July 9-15, 1972.

it possible to address problems linked to the theory of historical knowledge and auxiliary techniques of historians, while considering the propaedeutic value of the history of historiography (considered among the subject's themes), and the links between history and other forms of knowledge.¹⁹

The event's proposal covered six topics: 1) Issues regarding the introduction to the study of history; 2) The introduction to the study of history as a theory of historical knowledge: its value for the grounding of historical science and the epistemology of history-themes; 3) Introduction to the study of history and the historian's auxiliary techniques; 4) The propaedeutic value of the history of historiography and its place among the themes of an Introduction to the study of history; 5) The relations of history with other branches of knowledge; 6) The program of Introduction to the study of history and its placement in the history-curriculum. Scholars working with the subject were invited to submit their reflections, which were followed by the audience's remarks. These remarks were summarized in the annals.

This paper will only cover the two texts submitted by José Honório Rodrigues, not only due to space limitations, but also because he was considered a major author for discussions on the training of historians, and his books were used in degree courses. His efforts to build a model of professional training for Brazilian historians were widely recognized, a fact that allows pointing him as a key figure for grasping the challenges that stood before historical research in Brazil from the creation of the first university courses to the 1970s. Rodrigues also established a type of interpretation of the Brazilian history of historiography, which supposedly predominated until the 1970s, when new models of analysis began to emerge.²⁰

His first text, *O ensino superior da história e a reforma universitária* (“Higher education teaching of history and the universities' reform”, 1970a) was presented in the opening session; in turn, the second text, *Método, teoria, historiografia e pesquisa, disciplinas universitárias* (“Method, theory, historiography and research, university subjects”, 1970b) was not presented, but was included to the annals as an appendix.

¹⁹ Ten years before, motion 22 of the 1st APUH Symposium in 1961 pointed to the indispensability of ensuring a better methodological training for future historians, and suggested that Schools of Philosophy should institutionalize required courses of methodological introduction to history, theories of history, and history of historiography – preferably, under the same chair. The conclusion after the motions points to the need to create the subject “Introduction to historical studies and theory of history”, and suggests its breakdown into two subjects: Methodological Introduction to History, and Theory of History (Anais, 1972, p. 298-299, and 301). According to a study by Diogo Roiz, the University of São Paulo (USP) already had a subject named Introduction to historical studies, in 1956. The subject was taught by Jean Glénisson (1921-2010), whose textbook *Iniciação aos estudos históricos* (“Introduction to historical studies”, 1961), was based on his course notes.

²⁰ Regarding José Honório Rodrigues, see, for instance: IGLÉSIAS, 1988; FREIXO, 2012.

Both papers contain useful considerations for reflecting on the situation of history courses, as much as on the training of historians.²¹

At the conference, Rodrigues discusses the reform of the universities and the problems observed in the institutions, which, in his view, were generating an obstacle to the subject's development and vitiated the scholarly training-process. He criticizes the Brazilian structure of higher education by pointing to the dearth of physical facilities, the poverty of libraries and the scarcity of research funds, combined with the lack of support both to students and scholars, and the absence of enhancement and training courses. An additional problem would be the situation of the teaching career in higher education, which, according to him, was characterized by improvisation, favoritism and *pro forma* selection processes. Considering that it was a moment of crisis in the universities, he pointed out that a mood of disillusionment was expressed everywhere with the courses, the curricula and the lack of structure and support.

The text has two main targets: lifetime chair professorships and the curriculum of history courses. The former would lead both to immobility – since the chair's occupant was not obliged to produce anything about the subject of their chair – and to an obstruction to the development of vocations. And the latter was not a reason for enthusiasm either, since it was clung to a colonizing perspective and did not maintain links to the other social sciences. Be it through a reform or a revolution, change would not come from the scholars themselves, i.e., from chair occupants committed with the status quo. It would come, instead, from the young students.²² And it could not be merely a nominal change, since "what benefit is it (...), for instance, if history professors start calling themselves social scientists, when they have never even been historians?" (RODRIGUES, 1970a, p. 25). And in order to train historians, he proposes a curriculum-reform.²³ Rodrigues finishes his analysis by

²¹ The historian's training appears as a key problem in Rodrigues reflections in many texts. According to him, the very liberation of the history of Brazil from acritical and amateurish interpretations hinged on the ability to address this problem. For Rodrigues, the theoretical-methodological preparedness of a body of specialized professionals would favor the expansion of a critical type of education not only for the students, but also for the general public. See FREIXO, 2012.

²² At this point, the text seems to contain a typing error, as the author wrote: "I believe that the reform or revolution will come from the professors, from lifetime chair occupants committed with the status quo since its onset. Chair professors are part of the system; they are committed with the system. It will come from the youth, who are paying an extremely high price for the current mistakes" (RODRIGUES, 1970a, p. 24-25). It would not make sense to state that a change will come from the professors, while pointing that they are committed with the chair-system, and then affirm that the change will come from the youth. So, I believe that there is a "not" missing after "revolution will".

²³ The author remembers that the second edition of his book *Teoria da História do Brasil* (1957) already contains the criticism of what he considers as "the absurdity of four universal empires, namely Assyria,

stating that in Europe and the United States, there were no subjects called Ancient and Medieval, Modern and Contemporary History, and not even History of the Americas. He points to the following solutions: linking the history-course with other social subjects and offering more courses, periodical programs and flexibility. Furthermore, the basic chair of history of Brazil should not be assigned to a single lecturer; it would be preferable to split the subject into different periods or genres (economic history, diplomatic history), or according to other relevant features (RODRIGUES, 1970a, p. 25). In his opinion, the teaching of history of Brazil by a single professor could lead to a detrimental effect by favoring the predominance of:

(...) a conservative, traditionalist, nostalgic [type of history], expressing an attempt to colonize the youth; after being initiated in the primary course and maintained in the secondary level, it prevails in higher education and imposes a factual exposition of names, dates, titles, lists and data in a permanent strip tease naked of any idea, any comprehension, any intelligence and any meaning (RODRIGUES, 1970a, p. 26).

Besides proposing the extinction of lifelong professorship chairs and advocating for the professionalization of historians, Rodrigues presents a list of aspects that were harmful to training and professional life: precarious libraries and archives, the absence of research and professional enhancement centers, the lack of aid in terms of research funds for scholars and degree students. In his view, the professionalization of historians and the creation of a labor market could help the youth with a strong vocation take roots. And the profession's recognition through the approval of a law by the Congress would update an old Portuguese-Brazilian tradition, in which the royal chronicler and historiographer careers coexisted, by adapting them to the current conditions. He cites the examples of *Museu Paulista* (the São Paulo Museum), which, since 1946, had created four historiographer-positions, and of the International Labour Organization, which had already recognized the profession. Rodrigues also remembers that in the United States, a career of historian offered great opportunities in the public departments and agencies. He criticized the contempt of the Brazilian State for the tasks related to national history, in contrast to what was happening in the USA – a country which, in view of the impacts of So-

Persia, Macedonia and Rome; the madness of the extent of each chair, as well as the ignorance of the real historical forces that reshape our present and produce our future". He also draws attention to the lack of knowledge, which affects the training of secondary-level teachers, about the history of the United States, of the Soviet Union, of China, as well as about the "growing awareness about Eastern peoples, the African movement and Latin American stagnation". Therefore, "the curriculum is not only ridiculous, but is also a pedagogical scandal, a madness of professors, and an insult to historical consciousness" (RODRIGUES, 1970a, p. 25).

viet technological progress, considered the reform of teaching as an indispensable factor of its very national security. For this reason, the United States was investing to expand not only its cadres of scientists and engineers, but also of social scientists and professionals trained in humanities, to provide the nation with humanists and political leaders. The aim would be not only to train and educate the country's population, but also to foster and develop intelligence, thereby to obtain individuals more qualified for the tasks of managing a national strategy in the face of a Soviet threat. For Rodrigues, to provide the nation with a conscious and enlightened leadership is a necessary task, since "the field of decision-making, which determines the national destiny, is political; it is not a field of scientists, who, in turn, help and provide advice to it". Furthermore, according to the author, one of the causes for the failure of our history would be the inability of the civilian and military leadership to attain this aim. The reform of the teaching of history would be a crucial step in this direction, since "there is no political leadership without historical consciousness" (RODRIGUES, 1970a, p. 30).

The author was also concerned about the universities' reform, which, according to politicians and legal experts, should emphasize scientific aspects in order to integrate the universities to the industrial civilization or to the national market. For Rodrigues, this would be only one aspect of the problems, which included the funding modality (private, public or via foundations with independent funds), management structures (in the form of departments, institutes and colleges) and the participation of students, in addition to problems linked to the curriculum and recruiting of scholars. In connection with these issues, the extinction of chair professorships would be a claim both of students and of "the more modern adult spirits" (RODRIGUES, 1970a, p. 29-30).

His second paper *Método, teoria, historiografia e pesquisa como disciplinas universitárias* (RODRIGUES, 1970b) also brings important arguments for comprehending the state of History of Brazil as a subject in the late 1960s. The author builds on the finding that Brazil was not preparing young historians, since its main priority was to train secondary-level teachers of history. The country would be following the Portuguese tradition in which the teacher of history and the historian were seen as two different figures, in contrast to what was taking place in the big cities.

Rodrigues argues that the "vocation" for the study of history was born outside the universities, which could only help "germinate the ideal", since "the indispensable preliminary training of historians was not a direct preparation in history, but an indirect one, through the study of the language and of the law of a given period". In his opinion, being a historian meant having a vocation nurtured by a "historical sensitivity" and an "ability to reconstitute the past" that could not be taught. His principal idea, therefore, was that a historian is born a historian. Yet, he also recog-

nized that in his time, historians should be prepared through degree courses, and that the curricula should include the teaching of methods, the theoretical debate and the historiographic example. Even if the universities could not train historians, they could still provide them with "safe guidance" on the connections between methodology, theory and historiography as a tripod for the training of researchers (RODRIGUES, 1970b, p. 229-230).²⁴

Rodrigues doubted that college degree courses, which were structured to train history teachers, could also be able to train historians. He listed a diversity of cases which showed that for a long time, the training of historians in the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic or Portuguese-Brazilian traditions took place through indirect ways, and that the vocation of historians would be born outside the universities (RODRIGUES, 1970b, p. 229). Still, he concludes that the development of historiography would require the preparation of historians in the universities' institutional milieu. Furthermore,

no skepticism can defeat the belief that although we cannot train a historian, but only a secondary-level teacher of history, or a history researcher, the provision of a balanced curriculum and of teaching on methodology, on the theoretical debate, and on the historiographic example may at least offer safe guidance for generating the historian, even if they cannot produce them (RODRIGUES, 1970b, p.230).

Besides requiring the transmission and learning of methodology, the training of teachers and historians should be followed by the teaching of theory, historiography and historical research, which were understood to be the content of specific subjects (RODRIGUES, 1970b, p. 233-239 and 251-252).

Rodrigues' proposals on the training of historians did penetrate the universities' setting, as we may see in the positive reception of his works by academic periodicals,²⁵ as well as in the defense of his proposal to create a historical research institute during the 3rd ANPUH Symposium (Anais, 1966, p. 356), and in his presence in relevant events on the field.²⁶ Nonetheless, the possible results of his efforts were not

²⁴ For the project of renewal of historical studies in Brazil proposed by José Honório Rodrigues, see FREIXO, 2012.

²⁵ See, for instance, MATOS, 1971.

²⁶ Besides presenting the opening conference at the event, Rodrigues was also responsible for the closing conferences of the 7th National ANPUH Symposium in 1973 in Belo Horizonte, state of Minas Gerais, and of the 10th National ANPUH Symposium in Niterói, state of Rio de Janeiro, in 1979. In this event, he also spoke at the panel "The current problems of historical research in Brazil", along with Cecilia Westphalen (UFPR), Katia de Queiroz Mattoso (UFBA), Antônio Gonçalves de Melo (UFPE), Maria Luiza Marcílio (USP) and José Roberto do Amaral Lapa (UNICAMP). Rodrigues' thought was also the object

noticeable in the short term. In 1971, the field assessment undertaken by some historians during the 1st Seminar on Brazilian Studies points to problems related to the historian's training and obstacles to the development of historical studies in Brazil.

Between past and future: the 1st Seminar on Brazilian Studies (São Paulo, SP, 1971)

It is melancholic to observe that many of the best contributions to the clarifications in the field come from economists, sociologists, political analysts, and not from historians
(IGLÉSIAS, Anais, 1972, p. 33).

Picture 5



Opening session of the International Meeting on Brazilian Studies and 1st Seminar on Brazilian Studies, held by the Institute of Brazilian Studies (IEB) at the University of São Paulo (1971). From left to right: José Aderaldo Castelo (IEB President, 1966-1981), Orlando Marques de Paiva (Vice-President of the University of São Paulo) and Sérgio Buarque de Holanda (founder and director of the IEB in 1962-1964). Photo by Jorge Maruta, IEB Archives.

of a study of the USP scholar Raquel Glezer in her presentation at the 11th National ANPUH Symposium held in João Pessoa, state of Paraíba, in 1981. I return, at this point, to some aspects approached in a previous article (GONTIJO, 2017).

The overall proposal of the 1st IEB Seminar on Brazilian Studies (SEB in the acronym in Portuguese) in 1971 was to make possible “a survey – certainly a partial but, still, fecund one – on the past, present and upcoming situation of Brazilian studies in the range of humanities, both in Brazil and abroad”, in addition to making available “the data on what we have done so far, what we are doing and what we intend to do” in the field of social and human studies (Anais, 1972, p. 8).²⁷ Yet, according to Maria Isaura Pereira de Queiroz – the coordinator of the sociology-field during the event and author of its introductory monograph on the situation of her field of studies –, the moment was not favorable to the exercise of criticism, which is a necessary factor for the advancement of knowledge. In her words,

We are in a world in which, on all sides, transgressions of opinion seem to constitute the worst crimes. Our age of totalitarianisms will probably be inscribed in history with the same seal of arbitrariness and injustices as the age of the Inquisition. Let us beware, then. This is an atmosphere that is essentially against the development of science and culture, of knowledge in general, since it is an atmosphere that is essentially contrary to the freedom of criticism (Anais, 1972, p. 289).

It was, therefore, amid this mood of threats against freedom of expression after the enactment of Institutional Act 5 on December 13, 1968, that the Seminar was held – a moment in which many professors were undergoing compulsory retirement.²⁸

The event was structured into the fields of Sociology, Anthropology, History of Education, Brazilian Thought, Literature, History of Architecture, Geography and History. Its proposal was that each field should meet in working groups and draft a monograph including an introduction on the field, a panoramic view of its historical development, suggestions, research conditions and prospects, and general conclusions, in addition to a basic set of bibliographic references with primary and

²⁷ The 1st SEB was held at the same time of the International Meeting on Brazilian Studies and the National Meeting of Anthropology of the Brazilian Anthropological Society, promoted by the Institute of Brazilian Studies, linked to the University of São Paulo. The IEB is a research and archive unit created in 1962 by initiative of Sérgio Buarque de Holanda. The event also counted on the support of the Ministry of Foreign Relations, of the Federal Council of Culture, of the Foundation for Research Support of the State of São Paulo, and of the University of São Paulo.

²⁸ The university discharges in the wake of Institutional Act 5 in 1968 began in late April and lasted until October 1969. Over this period, many scholars were either forced to retire or dismissed throughout the country. The first list of removed scholars included Maria Yedda Linhares (1921-2011), Eulália Lahmeyer Lobo (1924-2011), Manoel Maurício de Albuquerque (1927-1981), Florestan Fernandes (1920-1995), Emilia Viotti da Costa (1928-2017), Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1931), Octavio Ianni (1926-2004), and Paula Beiguelman (1926-2009), among others. In Rodrigo Pato Sá Motta's words, the university-setting became “desolate and melancholic” (MOTTA, 2014, p. 151).

secondary sources. A group of four to six commentators from the field, and from other connected fields, would then debate the monograph. The overall aim was to produce an overview of the current state of Brazilian studies in many fields of knowledge and point to future expectations. The event's annals bring an extensive list of international participants, along with national participants from all regions of the country.²⁹

Alice Canabrava was responsible for drafting an introductory text on the field of history, and presented *Roteiro sucinto do desenvolvimento da historiografia brasileira* ["Brief outline of the development of Brazilian historiography"], an outline that discussed history from the 16th to the 20th centuries indicating stages, sources and relevant works of each period. From the 1930s on, she identifies methodological innovations linked to the development of quantitative history and to the renewal of the biography-genre. Going further, she points to the existence of specialized sub-fields on account of their object of study: the backlands-exploration and conquest; the Dutch rule-period, economic history, the slaver system, social history and political-administrative history.

Canabrava's *Roteiro* is part of a three-section monograph and corresponds to its retrospective part, which consists of a history of Brazilian historiography. It was followed by José Eduardo Marques Mauro's presentation entitled *A pesquisa histórica no Brasil* ["Historical research in Brazil"], which is the prospective section, including suggestions for investigations, by field of expertise (political history, economic history, social history and history of the ideas). The third section comprises a bibliographical survey presented by Nícia Villela Luz. Canabrava's *Roteiro*, as well as Mauro's report and Luz' bibliography were debated by Frédéric Mauro, Francisco Iglésias, Richard Graham, Cecilia Westphalen, Emilia Viotti da Costa, and others.³⁰ Some comments were quite long, with redaction marks, and are structured into parts. Such is the case of Frédéric Mauro's and Cecilia Westphalen's remarks, which provide another history of Brazilian historiography, and of Emilia Viotti da Costa's

²⁹ Under the general coordination of José Aderaldo Castello (1921-2011), then IEB president, the event received guests such as Alfredo Bosi (1936-2021), Antônio Candido de Mello e Souza (1918-2017), João Cruz Costa (1904-1978), Maria Isaura Pereira de Queiróz (1918-2018) and Sérgio Buarque de Holanda (1902-1982). This paper is focused on the discussions that took place in the working group of history, coordinated by Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, which counted on the participation of Alice Canabrava (1911-2003), Francisco Iglésias (1923-1999), Frédéric Mauro (1921-2001), Richard Graham (1934), Cecilia Westphalen (1927-2004), Emilia Viotti da Costa (1928-2017), Thomas Skidmore (1932-2016) and Francisco Falcon (1933), among others.

³⁰ Additional scholars who commented on the report were Manuel Correia de Oliveira Andrade, Sérgio da Costa Franco, and Antonietta de Aguiar Nunes, followed by Alice Canabrava's replica. Sérgio Buarque de Holanda only commented on Emilia Viotti da Costa's remarks about the report.

observations entitled *Anotações à margem do relatório de História* [“Notes on the margins of the history-report”]. Other communications on specific historical research themes were submitted later, followed by comments. Finally, a summary was drafted, including the motions and proposals presented in the event.

The meeting’s participants produced a review of historical studies in Brazil and expressed what Amaral Lapa later defined as a process of “consciousness-raising” about the field’s deficiencies and gaps, above all, *vis-à-vis* other sciences such as sociology and economics. For Francisco Iglésias and Emilia Viotti da Costa, history seemed to occupy, at that moment, a secondary role among the forms of knowledge that explained Brazil. Both historians understood that other fields could depict the Brazilian reality in better terms. That’s why they made such an effort to justify the assignment of new funds for historical research (GONTIJO, 2017).

Viotti da Costa pointed to the need to revise conceptual frameworks, similarly to what was happening in economics and sociology. According to her, the studies produced in these fields by researchers such as Maria Silvia de Carvalho, Franco Moreira, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Otávio Ianni, Paul Singer and Luciano Martins were promoting a revisionism which, although implicitly, corresponded to a certain extent to the works of historians such as Warren Dean, Boris Fausto and Ralph de la Cava. Such revisionism regarded “the characterization of the Brazilian development-model, the study of social groups and their agency in the political and economic process” over the 19th and 20th centuries (Anais, 1972, p. 51).

While commenting on the situation of historical research, and on the inefficient or even non-existent training of historians in Brazil, Iglésias drew attention to “the lack of professional awareness, for which history is seen as a work of amateurs, a form of leisure for retired or extravagant people”. To overcome such state of things, “a deeper awareness of the nature and possibilities of history, with a better preparation” would be in order. For this reason, it would be necessary to change the courses’ curricula and to modernize them by disseminating the achievements of other social sciences such as economics and sociology. The ability to engender a “living and dense history” hinged on this for furthering a solution to the national problems, instead of producing what the author identified as a “dead erudition or daydreaming and embellishment” (Anais, 1972, p. 28-29). This diagnosis was similar to that of the 1st APUH Symposium ten years before, but there was a difference: the need to get closer to the social sciences is more strongly stated in the discourses of 1971. Up to that moment, there was space for geography, anthropology and ethnolo-

gy in the curricula, but not for sociology, except for the cases not covered by the sources presented above.³¹

Viotti da Costa also drew attention to the relevance of economic explanations, which were seen as more objective and followed a stricter methodology (Anais, 1972, p. 31). In her words,

History, the oldest of the social sciences, has been fastened to its standards and has not followed the dynamism of other sciences, which, albeit younger, have developed methodologies that ascribed to them aspects of superiority. It is up to historians, therefore, to intensify their efforts in such way as to compensate the lost time and either shorten or eliminate the lag in which its subject finds itself *vis-à-vis* other sciences (economics, for instance) (Anais, 1972, p. 33).

In the particular case of the history of Brazil, she emphasized the necessity of a "professional awareness", in such a way that it may produce:

(...) no longer a history cultivated as a form of leisure or with apologetic aims, but, instead, as a scientific, serious, objective task which may play a role in an eminently living society such as the current one. Only then will it start to be considered as an important thing, as something that must be done, thereby overcoming the situation of relative disregard in which it finds itself now. It is indispensable that historians assume the job that befits them, namely, of social scientists. It is melancholic to observe that many of the best contributions to the clarifications in the field come from economists, sociologists, political analysts, and not from historians. If Brazilian historians are not duly warned about the situation in which they find themselves, it is possible that they will be relegated to the sidelines, either by other social scientists who may take their post, or by foreign historians who dedicate themselves to Brazilian themes (Anais, 1972, p. 33-34).

Iglésias' melancholy in the early 1970s supposedly derives from the finding that history, "the oldest of the social sciences", had lost explanatory strength and made way for other forms of knowledge – above all, to economics. But how did such loss occur? The discussions on the curriculum of degree courses in 1961 and 1968, combined with the perceptions on the state of Brazilian historiography in 1971, contribute to an understanding about the subject's history, and set parameters for the training of researchers.

³¹ The curriculum had been changed in 1955, with the separation of the courses of history and geography. Marieta de Moraes Ferreira considers that this change enabled stronger links with the other social sciences, bearing in mind the inclusion of anthropology, ethnology and ethnography, while the key guidelines of the history-course at the University of Brazil (established in 1939) were maintained, as well as the aim of training secondary teaching professionals without research links. In Ferreira's words, "the professionalization of the investigator was left outside the university-space" (FERREIRA, 2012, p. 617-618).

The construction of a professional practice and an *ethos* for researchers

In distinct formats and with different denominations (such as congresses, seminars, and symposiums), academic events have played a key role in the scientific world since the 19th century. They are part of the disciplinary professionalization-process, and contribute to the promotion of debates and the sharing of research work. They also play a role in the intensification of disputes for recognition and power, in the acclaim of researchers, in the legitimization of research agendas, in the definition of collective themes and problems and, in certain cases, in the disclosure of the academic production to a wider audience. Their study also helps understanding the position and circulation of intellectuals in a field. Furthermore, they are important networking spaces where bonds are built and (re)affirmed, as well as collective projects and ideals.³²

The three events described above give us a view of certain aspects of a practice that consists in organizing events, gathering people, proposing themes and problems for reflection, calling for monographs for participants' appreciation, encouraging debates and producing their records, to some extent, in the form of annals, in addition to deliberating on individual or collective propositions.

Returning to the initial hypothesis, it may be concluded that in the course of the 1960s and early 1970s, there was, if not an awareness-raising process, at least the construction of a collective understanding of the conditions and possibilities of historiographic production in Brazil. Such awareness or construction is characterized by the reflection on the historians' training, which, in turn, is stimulated by the creation of spaces for academic exchanges, such as the events above. Such reflections have established key references for practice in the field of history and outlined a profile for the professionals to be trained.

In this sense, all three events made it possible for a degree of consensus on the state of historical studies and the training of historians and teachers over a decade to be built. Even though one may notice, within the limits imposed by the events' annals, that there were dissonant voices on some of the approached themes, there was, indeed, a certain alignment in the debates around problems that were seen as relevant by the participant historians: the precariousness of existing archives, the

³² A highlight in Brazil is the pioneering contribution of GUIMARÃES, 2004 and 2005, to the study of history congresses, in addition to the thesis written by Paulo Thiago Santos Gonçalves da Silva (2014) on the ANPUH (1961-1977) and the role of symposiums for the association's consolidation. See also RODRIGUEZ, 2018; BLÄNSDORF, 2010; and the dossier “*Les congrès lieux de l'échange intellectuel*”, published in the periodical *Mil neuf cent, Revue d'histoire intellectuelle*, n. 7, 1989.

excessive curricular focus on content-lecturing, the need for a better overall training for students (supposedly as a result of the subjects' excessive focus on lecturing), the relevance of teaching about research methodology, and so on. Some interpretations on the situation of historical studies in Brazil, such as the one put forward by Lapa in the mid-1970s (LAPA, 1976), can be understood as an individual view which, in a certain way, summarizes the concerns shared by many scholars over the previous decade. The "consciousness-raising" process affirmed by Lapa in the mid-1970s can be interpreted as a product of intellectual exchanges and critical exercises enabled by such academic events, which have contributed so that certain ideas on the past, present and future of the history-field could be built.

Some historians, men and women alike, seem to have played a key role in the construction of this collective understanding by producing overviews on research and the writing of history in Brazil in the past and present, and by pinpointing obstacles to the development of historical studies, identifying problems in degree courses and the training of students, commenting on these overviews in academic events, and proposing reviews and collective paths.

The crisis perceived by Amaral Lapa in the mid-1970s emerged from a perception that, after four decades since the creation of the first degree courses, historical research had not yet fully developed in the universities. Likewise, the training of students, which had been expanded through the creation of schools of philosophy around the country, still left much to be desired.

In different moments, there was a visible concern with the curriculum, which pointed both to what had been possible and what still needed to be changed.³³ Above all, the sources give a glimpse of certain conceptions regarding the subject's role, and the expectations of what historians could be and do.³⁴

³³ It is important to remember that the sources analyzed in this paper present debates on the curriculum. They do not correspond to the formal curricula, and even less to the real curricula applied in each institution, even though they do provide information on what was actually taught in each course. The official curricular schedules of the history courses taught at the University of Brazil and at USP in their initial decades can be read in the studies of FERREIRA, 2013, and COSTA, 2012, for instance. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the curricula of some institutions underwent changes with the inclusion of subjects such as Research Techniques at UFRJ, and Research Methods and Techniques, in the history course taught at UFPR, both of which had a practical-theoretical and applied character (FONSECA, 1971, p. 365; WESTPHALEN and MEQUELUSSE, 1971, p. 365). The annals of the 1st Brazilian Conference on Introduction to the Study of History (1970) bring programs of this subject from 29 institutions, including an institution abroad, namely the University of Montevideo in Uruguay.

³⁴ While asking which issues a curricular discourse seeks to address, Tomaz Tadeu da Silva points that "the key issue, which acts as a backdrop for any curriculum-theory, is knowing which knowledge must be taught". For the author, the issue of what should be taught is never considered independently from another question: "what they [the students] must become". The training-process leads precisely to a

The reflections presented in the three events above reveal an expectation that the methodological learning of research techniques should be bolstered. For instance, for Eduardo D'Oliveira França and Cecilia Westphalen, it was more desirable to transmit methods and techniques than historical content (Anais, 1962, p. 108 and 96). However, the design of the – officially valid, or proposed – curricula valued above all the acquiring of general historiographic knowledge on different historical periods, from an eminently Eurocentric perspective, which set a premium on ancient and medieval history, in detriment of the study of modern and contemporary history, or even Brazilian history. The course load of content-disciplines was higher, in detriment of underpinning subjects, even though the prevailing conception was that it was necessary to teach research basics in the training of historians and specific didactic content in the training of teachers. Students' training also required the learning of languages, above all, Greek and Latin, so that students could be in contact with classical antiquity and medieval sources. Therefore, the erudite model prized the broad, generalist knowledge of Western and, above all, European culture, which could be expanded on with the addition of studies on the history of the Americas and Brazil, in addition to the history of non-Western civilizations – a feature of but a few courses.³⁵

Despite the remarks in the sense of valuing technical learning in connection with investigative practices, there was either little or no space in the curricular proposals for providing the students with activities of initiation to historical research, since many participants considered this as an activity aimed at specialization or graduate careers – and none of the two options was available at that point in time. In regard to the training of teachers, it would be a task for the pedagogical field, this way consolidating the “3 + 1” format (three years of basic content in the history-course, plus one year of pedagogical subjects).³⁶ Under the guidelines of the core

change in the persons who will “follow” a certain curriculum (SILVA, 2005, p. 14-15). Therefore, reflecting on the training of historians necessarily entails a reflection on the curriculum of degree courses, to be supplemented by the question about the role of historians in contemporary society.

³⁵ The University of Bahia had a Center for Afro-Eastern Studies, which was active from 1959 to 1994. At the APUH Symposium in 1961, Francisco Falcon suggests the creation of Afro-Asian study centers and argues that to oppose them would be to contradict the present. He also points out that there was a lack of specialists in “African-topics”, which were needed by the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Relations. Eremildo Vianna agreed with the idea, whereas Olga Pantaleão considered such centers a diversion in order to meet the “international political junctures of the present moment”. The topic was converted into a motion signed by Amaral Lapa, who underscored the existence of the Bahian center and asked for a partnership with African universities for obtaining access to their documents (Anais, 1962, p. 259, 267, 279 and 288, respectively).

³⁶ Decree-Law 1190, of April 4, 1939, provided for the structure of schools of philosophy, sciences and linguistics, which should teach their regular courses over a maximum period of three years before

curriculum established in 1961, degree courses were aimed at preparing students for the secondary-level teaching-career, whereas history scholars did not need to be historians with a formal degree, but should have *solid training in their subject*. The discussions above consider what such *solid training* would be like, and one may figure out what professional profile they were seeking to prepare: bachelors should have general knowledge on certain contents, and should be able to deal with them at the school-setting.

One must add to these propositions the scholars' negative perception about the students who were joining the courses. As Olga Pantaleão remarked, "we are receiving students who are poorly prepared for taking the history-course. A general, basic culture is lacking among students" (Anais, 1962, p. 225). The exceptions that confirm the rule were the students coming from the School of Law (RODRIGUES, 2013). Perhaps for this reason, the university-curriculum sought to compensate for what the students had not learned at school by providing this generalist, basic culture. Meanwhile, little or no time was left for stimulating research practices and reflection on the historian's craft – which, in turn, usually drew its inputs from the theoretical reflection. And the students responded by reading, and by seeking to master historiography. In the words of Francisco Falcon, who was a student at the National School of Philosophy at the University of Brazil in the early 1950s, "the key thing was to read, to read a lot, to master the updated bibliographic references, combined with the historiography on the main themes" (FALCON, 2012, p. 7-8). But the students also responded with complaints about outdated teaching practices and little attention to research activities (FERREIRA, 2012 and 2013).

The historiography-landscape in Brazil in the early 1970s was quite pessimistic, considering the analyses produced by Iglésias, Viotti da Costa, Amaral Lapa and Carlos Guilherme Mota.³⁷ Such mood was partly due to the problems identified in connection with the training of historians, which did not keep pace with what was being experienced in the social sciences – particularly, in economics and sociology. At the same time, it was pointed out that historical research in Brazil was large-

issuing baccalaureate-diplomas. The "licentiate"-title, in turn, could be obtained by bachelors, as long as they took an additional year of didactics-subjects. This format became known as the "3 + 1" arrangement. Further on, Informed Opinion 292 issued by the Federal Council of Education on April 11, 1962, regulated licentiate degree-courses and defined the minimum course load for pedagogical training, namely 1/8 of the hourly load of specific courses, which at that moment were structured into a series of eight academic semesters. This settlement broke through the distribution of subjects as provided under the 3+1 arrangement. For a history of these developments, see the Federal Council of Education's Informed Opinion 28/2001.

³⁷ See, for instance, IGLÉSIAS, 1971; MOTA, 1973.

ly produced by foreigners, erudite learners and amateurs, as well as by university scholars trained in the traditional way. In order to modify such state of things, one of the key prescriptions continued to be the teaching of research methodologies (Anais, 1972, p. 40).

For Iglésias, the lag could be fixed through curricular changes. But the issue at hand was not only a theoretical, conceptual and scientific update-movement. In addition to it, a new, modern historical sensitivity required from historians the ability to take on another role in the world, and history students were expected to develop "a deeper consciousness of the nature and possibilities of history, with increased preparedness" and a "professional awareness", which would be earned along the way as they assume their function as social scientists (Anais, 1972, p. 28-9 and 33-4). Yet, between the teaching of methods and techniques, the prevailing factor was the teaching of content. And the outcomes of this choice pointed to the hardships experienced in the constitution of a university-discipline, as well as to its sluggish professionalization-process.

Main Sources:

- APUH. *Anais do I Simpósio de Professores de História do Ensino Superior*. Marília: Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de Marília, 1962.
- APUH-Rio de Janeiro. *Anais do I Encontro Brasileiro sobre Introdução ao Estudo da História*. Niterói: UFF / APUH, 1970, 2 vols.
- ANPUH. *Anais do III Simpósio dos Professores Universitários de História*. Franca, SP, 1966.
- ANPUH. *Anais do VII Simpósio dos Professores Universitários de História*. Belo Horizonte, MG, 1973.
- ANPUH. *Anais do X Simpósio dos Professores Universitários de História*. Niterói, RJ, 1979.
- ANPUH. *Anais do XI Simpósio dos Professores Universitários de História*. João Pessoa, RJ, 1981.
- BRASIL. Lei n. 5.692, de 11/08/1971. Fixa diretrizes e bases para o ensino de 1º e 2º graus, e dá outras providências. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, DF, 12/08/1971.
- CONSELHO FEDERAL DE EDUCAÇÃO. Parecer 28/2001, de 18/01/2001. Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/o28.pdf>
- IEB. *Anais do I Seminário de Estudos Brasileiros*. São Paulo: IEB / USP, 1972.
- IGLÉSIAS, Francisco. A pesquisa histórica no Brasil. *Revista de História*, USP, n. 88, 4º trimestre de 1971, p. 373-415.
- FONSECA, Célia Freire d'Aquino. Comunicação. In: WESTPHALEN, Cecília e MEQUELUSSE, Jair [Orgs.]. Estado atual da pesquisa histórica no Brasil. XXIII Reunião Anual da Sociedade Brasileira para o Progresso da Ciência (1971). *Revista de História*, USP, n. 88, 4º Trimestre 1971, p. 365.
- FRANÇA, Eduardo D'Oliveira. O novo currículo do Departamento de História da Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas da Universidade de São Paulo para 1971. *Revista de História*, USP, n. 88, 4º Trimestre 1971, p. 535-347.

- GLÉNISSON, Jean. *Iniciação aos estudos históricos*. Com a colaboração de Pedro Moacyr Campos e Emília Viotti da Costa. Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1961.
- GLEZER, Raquel e ABUD, Katia. Pesquisa de história do Brasil (trabalhos em realização). *Revista de História, USP*, n. 88, 4º trimestre, 1971, p. 369-371.
- LAPA, José Roberto do Amaral. *A história em questão: historiografia brasileira contemporânea*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1976.
- MATOS, Odilon Nogueira de. José Honório Rodrigues e a historiografia Brasileira. *Revista de História, USP*, n. 88, 4º trimestre de 1971, p. 527-534.
- MOTA, Carlos Guilherme. Nota sobre a historiografia brasileira contemporânea. *Revista de História, USP*, v. 48, 1974, p. 193-219.
- RODRIGUES, José Honório. 1970a. O ensino superior da história e a reforma universitária. *Anais do I Encontro Brasileiro sobre Introdução ao Estudo da História*. Niterói: UFF / APUH, 1970, p. 15-31.
- RODRIGUES, José Honório. 1970b. Método, Teoria, Historiografia e Pesquisa, disciplinas universitárias. *Anais do I Encontro Brasileiro sobre Introdução ao Estudo da História*. Niterói: UFF / APUH, 1970, p. 228-235.
- WESTPHALEN, Cecília e MEQUELUSSE, Jair. Estado atual da pesquisa histórica no Brasil. XXIII Reunião Anual da Sociedade Brasileira para o Progresso da Ciência (1971). *Revista de História, USP*, n. 88, 4º Trimestre 1971, p. 353-368.

Bibliographical References

- BLÄNSDORF, Agnes. "Une collaboration scientifique 'dans un esprit vraiment œcuménique et international': Les congrès internationaux d'historiens et le Comité International des Sciences Historiques dans l'Entre-deux-guerres" *Revue germanique internationale*, v. 12, 2010, p. 209-228 [1-18]. Access on Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/rig.413>
- BLOCH, Marc. *Apologia da história ou o ofício do historiador*. 1ª. ed. francesa 1949. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2001. Cited in this paper in English from *The historian's craft*. New York: Vintage Books, 1964, p. 13.
- BURMESTER, Ana Maria. *A (des)construção do discurso histórico: a historiografia brasileira dos anos 70*. 1ª. ed. 1997. Curitiba: Aos Quatro Ventos, 1998.
- CAMARGO JR., Mauro Vaz de. Questões sobre a "profissionalização da história": a disciplina Introdução aos estudos históricos no I Simpósio de Professores de História do Ensino Superior (1961). *Fato & Versões – Revista de História: Historiografia e escrita da história*, v. 8, n. 15, 2016, p. 70-89.
- COSTA, Aryana Lima. *De um curso d'água a outro: memória e disciplinarização do saber histórico na formação dos primeiros professores no curso de História da USP*. Tese de doutorado em História - Programa de Pós-Graduação em História Social, UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro, UFRJ, 2018.
- FERREIRA, Marieta de Moraes. O ensino da história na Faculdade Nacional de Filosofia da Universidade do Brasil. *História, Ciências, Saúde – Manguinhos*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 19, n. 2, abr./jun. 2012, p. 611-636. Access on Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-59702012000200014>

- FERREIRA, Marieta de Moraes. *A história como ofício: a constituição de um campo disciplinar*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, 2013.
- FALCON, Francisco José Calazans. A historiografia brasileira contemporânea, 1958-1969. In: *Estudos de teoria da história e historiografia*, vol. II - Historiografia. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2015, p. 150-217.
- FREIRE, Diego José Fernandes. *O passado da história: os historiadores e as historiadoras da Universidade de São Paulo e a história da historiografia brasileira na década de 1970*. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, tese de doutorado em História, 2020.
- FREIRE, Diego José Fernandes. A experiência da história: o presente e o futuro da historiografia nos anos 1970. *Projeto História*, São Paulo, v. 72, set. / dez. 2021, p. 359-383. Access on: Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23925/2176-2767.2021v72p359-383>
- FREIXO, André Lemos. *A arquitetura do novo: ciência e história da História do Brasil em José Honório Rodrigues*. Tese de doutorado em História - Programa de Pós-Graduação em História Social, UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro, 2012.
- GLEZER, Raquel (org.). *Do passado para o futuro. Edição comemorativa dos 50 anos da ANPUH*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2011.
- GONTIJO, Rebeca. *O velho vaqueano. Capistrano de Abreu: memória, historiografia e escrita de si*. Rio de Janeiro: 7Letras, 2013.
- GONTIJO, Rebeca. Revisão e prospecção da historiografia no Brasil nos anos 1970 In: BENTIVOGLIO, Julio e NASCIMENTO, Bruno César (Orgs.). *Escrever história: historiadores e historiografia brasileira nos séculos XIX e XX*. Carapina: Milfontes, 2017, p. 91-122.
- GUIMARÃES, Lúcia Maria Paschoal. IV Congresso de História Nacional: tendências e perspectivas da história do Brasil colonial (Rio de Janeiro, 1949). *Revista Brasileira de História*, São Paulo, v. 24, n. 48, 2004, p. 145-170. Access on: Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-01882004000200007>
- GUIMARÃES, Lúcia Maria Paschoal. Primeiro Congresso de História Nacional: breve balanço da atividade historiográfica no alvorecer do século XX. *Tempo*, Niterói, v. 9, n. 18, 2005, p. 147-170. Access on: Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-77042005000100007>
- IGLÉSIAS, Francisco. José Honório Rodrigues e a historiografia brasileira. *Estudos Históricos*, v. 1, n. 1, 1988, p. 55-78.
- Mil neuf cents*, Revue d'histoire intellectuelle, n. 7, 1989, dossier Les congrès lieux de l'échange intellectuel 1850-1914. Access on: Feb. 27, 2024. https://www.persee.fr/doc/mcm_0755-8287_1989_num_7_1_974
- NASCIMENTO, Thiago Rodrigues. O primeiro Simpósio de Professores de História no Ensino Superior (1961): currículo e formação dos professores. *Cadernos de História da Educação*, v. 16, n. 1, jan.-abr. 2017, p. 286-304. Access on: Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/che-V16n1-2017-17>
- NASCIMENTO, Thiago Rodrigues. A formação do professor de História no Brasil: percurso histórico e periodização. *Revista História Hoje*, v. 2, n. 4, 2013, p. 265-304. Access on: Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20949/rhhj.v2i4.98>
- NASCIMENTO, Thiago Rodrigues. *O ensino de Estudos Sociais no Brasil: das "connexões naturais" à integração pela via do autoritarismo (1930-1970)*. Rio de Janeiro: PUC-Rio, tese de doutorado em Educação, 2019.

- MELLO, Ricardo Marques de. *Tendências historiográficas na Revista Brasileira de História: 1981-2000*. Tese de doutorado em História - Programa de Pós-Graduação em História, UnB, Brasília, 2012.
- MOTTA, Rodrigo Patto Sá. *As universidades e o regime militar*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2014.
- RODRIGUES, Lidiane Soares. Armadilha à francesa: homens sem profissão. *História da Historiografia*, n. 11, abril 2013, p. 85-103. Access on Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15848/hh.voi11.539>
- RODRIGUEZ, Martha. De historiadores y de los posibles usos de su saber: la contribución de los Congresos Internacionales de Historia de América en la conformación de una identidad americana (décadas de 1930 a 1960). *História da Historiografia*, Ouro Preto, n. 27, mai./ago. 2018, p. 91-117. Access on: Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15848/hh.voi27.1368>
- ROIZ, Diogo. *Os caminhos (da escrita) da história e os descaminhos do seu ensino*. Curitiba: Appris, 2012.
- ROIZ, Diogo. A institucionalização do ensino universitário de história na Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras da Universidade de São Paulo entre 1934 e 1936. *Ágora*, Santa Cruz do Sul, v. 13, n. 1, 2007, p. 65-104. Access on: Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17058/agora.v13i1.111>
- SANTOS, Beatriz Boclin Marques dos. O currículo das escolas brasileiras na década de 1970: novas perspectivas historiográficas. *Ensaio: avaliação e políticas públicas em educação*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 22, n. 82, jan./mar. 2014, p. 149-170. Access on: Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40362014000100008>
- SILVA, Norma Lúcia da e FERREIRA, Marieta de Moraes. Os caminhos da institucionalização do ensino superior de História. *História & Ensino*, Londrina, v. 2, n. 17, jul./dez. 2011, p. 283-306. Access on: Feb. 27, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5433/2238-3018.2011v17n2p283>
- SILVA, Paulo Thiago Santos. *A Associação Nacional dos Professores Universitários de História: espaço de identificação profissional e legitimação do saber histórico (1961-1977)*. Tese de doutorado em História - Programa de Pós-Graduação em História, UnB, Brasília, 2014.
- SILVA, Renata Augusta dos Santos. *A quem cabe formar o(a) professor(a) de história? Os caminhos e debates em torno da construção de um ethos de formação*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV Editora, 2023.
- SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da. *Documentos de identidade: uma introdução às teorias do currículo*. Belo Horizonte, 2005.

Received: 15/09/2023 – Approved: 21/02/2024

Editors in Charge

Miguel Palmeira & Stella Maris Scatena Franco